# UNITY

*FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION*


Lincoln and the Gettysburg Address - - - - - - - *Arthur L. Weatherly*

Religion and the Future - - - - - - - *F. H. Amphlett Micklewright*

Reshaping the World - - *David M. Bloch*

The Procedure of Persuasion - - - - - - - - - *Donald Harrington*

Trumpets on New Horizons
*Edited by Lucia Trent*



VOLUME CXXVIII NUMBER 9

Chicago, November, 1942

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

# UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

*Published Monthly* *Subscription $1.50*
*Until Further Notice* *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
*"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."*

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*


### Contributors

*Arthur L. Weatherly:* Recently retired as minister of All Souls' Unitarian Church, Lincoln, Nebraska, where for the past quarter of a century he was an outstanding leader in the affairs of city and state.

*F. H. Amphlett Micklewright:* Minister of The Unitarian Church of The Saviour, Southampton, England.

*David M. Bloch:* Free lance writer and lecturer.

*Donald Harrington:* Minister of the People's Liberal Church of Chicago, Illinois.

## *Contents*


EDITORIAL—
Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES....131
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES....134

ARTICLES—
Lincoln and the Gettysburg Address—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY...134
Religion and the Future—F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT....137
Reshaping the World—DAVID M. BLOCH....139
The Procedure of Persuasion—DONALD HARRINGTON....141

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
Maccabee and Nazarene—FANIA KRUGER....140
We Give You the World of Tomorrow—LILITH LORRAINE....140
Life Is Good—AMY BRUNER ALMY....140
Above the Ruin of War—ALINE B. CARTER....140

POETRY—
The Rose of Sharon—WILLIAM W. LOCKE....133
Nightmare—GEORGE L. THOMPSON....138

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Way Out—C. A. HAWLEY....142
Too Hopeful—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY....142
Idealistic Liberalism—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES....143
Memorable Poetry—Etta Josephean Murfey....143

CORRESPONDENCE—
India and Gandhi—L. E. BLOCHMAN....144
Reply to Mrs. Eastman....144
Prayer—Talk to One's Self—LYDIA NILSSON STJERNBERG....144


## The Field

*"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."*

The Reverend Harold Marley, minister of The Unitarian Church, Ann Arbor, Michigan, since 1928, has accepted a call to the First Unitarian Church of Dayton, Ohio.

The Reverend John N. Booth, of the Meadville Class of 1942, was installed as minister of the All Souls' Unitarian Church of Evanston, Illinois, on the evening of Friday, October 30, 1942. The installation sermon was delivered by Dr. John Haynes Holmes of the Community Church, New York City.

The Reverend Morton Nachlas, of the Meadville Class of 1942, has received a call to the First Unitarian Society, Marietta, Ohio.

The new chapel of the Congregational Unitarian Church of Flint, Michigan—the Reverend Harold Scott, minister—was dedicated on Sunday, September 27. The dedicatory address was delivered by Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Dean of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago.

The Reverend Rupert Holloway, minister of the First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin, from 1931 to 1940, has accepted a call to the pastorate of the First Unitarian Church of Wichita, Kansas.

The Annual Conference of the Iowa Unitarian Association was held in Des Moines, Iowa, October 26 and 27. The Arthur Markley Judy Foundation Lecture was delivered by the Reverend Wallace W. Robbins of the Unity Church of St. Paul, Minnesota.

The Reverend Carl B. Bihldorff resigned at Louisville to accept a call to the First Parish in Brookline, Mass. Until the settlement of a new minister at Louisville, Dr. Augustus P. Reccord, formerly of Detroit, is acting as interim minister.

The Reverend Edward W. Ohrenstein, minister of The Unitarian Church of Hinsdale, Illinois, since 1935, has accepted a call to the Third Congregational Society of Greenfield, Mass.

The President of the Western Unitarian Conference, Dr. Curtis W. Reese, has filled the following appointments this autumn:

September 13—Dayton Ohio
20—Cedar Rapids, Iowa
27—Flint, Michigan
30—Hanska, Minnesota
October 4—Ann Arbor, Michigan
5—Horton Michigan
11-15—Boston, Massachusetts
25—Bloomington, Illinois
27—Des Moines, Iowa
30—Evanston, Illinois

# UNITY

*"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"*

Volume CXXVIII NOVEMBER, 1942 No. 9

## Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

Consider the position of the German people! They are the most bitterly hated people in all the world today. They are surrounded by tortured, angry, revengeful populations waiting for the hour when they may rise and massacre their oppressors. They face, in case of defeat in this war, a dismemberment of their country and long years of slavery and humiliation. What protection have they against this fate? Only Hitler and his armies. We talk of Germany breaking up under the impact of the war. Germany will never break up so long as the threats of her enemies appear more terrible than anything she may suffer in continuing the war. The Germans will never turn against their Fuehrer while he stands between them and a doom of vengeance at the hands of Britain and Russia which seems worse than death itself. Ambassador Grew has said that Germany may "crack." So she may! But only if the United Nations make it plain that they will protect the Germans from all the worst that they now fear. The task of the United Nations, in other words, is to outbid the Nazis in offering security and salvation to the hard-pressed German people. So long as the Germans' one hope, however desperate, is Hitler, so long they will cling to him as a drowning man to a prickly thorn. Why otherwise does Goebbels broadcast daily to his German listeners horrific stories of the fate awaiting them if they lose the war? But let the Allies offer a hope of release greater than any that the Fuehrer and his minions can present, and the Germans will turn upon their masters and rend them every one. This is what Woodrow Wilson saw so clearly in the last war, and made so clear to the Germans. The result of the Wilsonian policy of a merciful peace, fairer than any guaranty the Kaiser could offer, was a disruption of the national morale, and a turning of the Germans from the Kaiser to the American President. Alas, that Wilson's pledge was so betrayed! But now the situation is the same; and the same policy, this time rooted in honor, will bring the same result. You cannot tell me that the Germans are not weary of this war. I will not believe that these people are not sick and tired of this dictator who has led their sons to futile slaughter and exposed their cities to fatal bombing. How gladly would they cast off the whole monstrous incubus of tyranny and terror! But never so long as such action will serve only to toss them from the frying pan of Nazi rule into the fire of Allied revenge. The United Nations must make it plain that they are as interested in rescuing Germans as other peoples. When that is done, the war will be done, too!

II

A heavily censored dispatch from London to the New York *Herald-Tribune* brings news of a great India protest meeting held in London, "attended by hundreds of Britons and a handful of Indians." This coincides with a similar meeting held in New York which packed the Town Hall in that city and turned many hundreds of people away. The meeting in London was addressed by members of Parliament who "launched fierce attacks on the British government" and denounced Prime Minister Churchill's September 10th statement as "misleading." Stephen Davies, Labor member in Parliament from Wales, "flayed the government policy, [and] waved both fists at the 'small group of British imperialists who are clinging to India and systematically defeating any step toward a proper solution' in the face of the obvious desire of the 'democratic mass of the British nation' to give India its freedom." Resolutions passed by this London meeting expressed "horror at the savage repression and sporadic violence which have ravaged India," called attention to the fact that, in a period of eight weeks "the Indian people have been fired upon 234 times," and called for "the recognition of Indian independence." With such support from England, Americans may well give themselves wholeheartedly to the cause of a free India. And, happily, they are doing so! The tide of public sentiment in support of India is steadily rising. People are wondering why interventionism, taught so insistently as related to Europe and China, should not now apply as well to India. They are beginning to see, as the Chinese people see, that the whole outcome of this war may well be in-

volved in what Britain does or does not do with this "brightest jewel in her imperial crown." The American people, like the English people, love freedom, are moved by deeply humane sentiments, and have a clear intelligence. Therefore an occupied country in Asia is to them as dreadful a spectacle as an occupied country in Europe. A Hindu crouching under an English whip shocks them no less than a Belgian or a Pole crouching under a Nazi whip. And Gandhi in prison in India looms as terrible a figure as Niemoeller in prison in Germany. The Indian question will not down. This protesting cry from England itself proves this. There is no answer to any demand for freedom but *freedom.* America proved this in 1776; India is proving it again in 1942.

III

How interesting it is to know, especially in this crisis of affairs, that there are Quakers in India! This fact established, it is not surprising to learn that these Quakers hold Yearly Meetings, conduct schools and settlements, carry on hospital and medical service, and are engaged in other good works, such as a weavers' cooperative. These Indian Quakers, of course, are all for Gandhi and his movement for independence. The *Friends Intelligencer* reports that, shortly before his lamented death, Gandhi's secretary, the beloved Mahadev Desai, addressed the Conference of Scattered Friends, and "gave the challenge of Gandhi's absolute pacifism." This same Conference reaffirmed its statement of two years ago against war, seeing no reason why the near approach of an enemy should suspend adherence to moral principle, or in any way invalidate such principle. This statement, as published in the *Intelligencer,* reads in part:

> We declare our faith that . . . violence cannot be removed by further violence . . . Our duty of witness may involve for us even the complete rejection of the claims of our own nation to our service in war. . . . We believe that our faith [in unarmed love] shown forth in practise may be India's greatest gift to the world.

This statement, it is interesting to note, was sent to all church leaders in India. This was a wise move as setting an example. Lifting the cross, so to speak, on a high hill! For all too many of the Christian missionaries and clergymen in India are toadies of government, listening first and last not to Christ but to the British *Raj.* Shortly after the outbreak of this war, the government of India sent a communication to Christian leaders, ordering them to pledge their full allegiance to the regime. Two only of these leaders refused to take this pledge, explaining that, as ministers of religion, their full allegiance was not to any earthly government but to God alone, thereby affirming the dictum of Charles Evans Hughes, when Chief Justice of our Supreme Court, that "the essence of religion is belief in a relation to God involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation." These two clergymen were promptly deported. The rest toed the mark and "presented arms." So we are glad that the Indian Quakers did not hide their light under a bushel, but set it on a candlestick, so to speak, that it might give light "unto all that are in the house."

IV

It is not too late to acclaim Attorney General Biddle's Columbus Day address, in which he announced that the 600,000 non-naturalized Italians in this country had been taken out of the ranks of "alien enemies," and thus relieved of all suspicion of disloyalty. I wonder if ever before in any country, in any war, there has been such a superb gesture of confidence and good will. It does infinite credit to the great body of Italians involved, for the action was taken only after exhaustive investigation by a department of government solemly charged with the responsibility of guarding the nation, in this hour of crisis, from domestic betrayal. But it does infinite credit as well to the administration which is eager to trust the people of this country and not to repress and humiliate them. What I find supremely satisfying in this policy of the Attorney General is its confirmation of my unshakable conviction that the overwhelming majority of Americans, native, naturalized, or non-naturalized, citizens or aliens, are utterly loyal to this republic. Of all the one hundred and thirty millions of our inhabitants, I doubt if more than a few thousands are moved by hostile sympathies; and of these, in turn, I doubt if more than a few hundred are plotting any sabotage or treason. These few must be watched, and, if guilty, punished. But all the more impressive is the spectacle of the great mass of the people living in devoted fidelity to their country. Why should it be otherwise? For America is not merely territory and wealth and trade and government. America is the air we breathe, the life we live. It is an impulse that flows in our blood, a spirit that burns and flames in our minds. Millions have been born in this country, and therefore know it and love it as they love their own homes. Other millions have come here from afar, and at the moment they have touched this soil have been, as by some magic influence, transformed. We are all Americans, whatever our birth or origin, and never so united as at this critical moment of national destiny. Of course, we have different opinions, and support different political parties, and cling to different moral and spiritual convictions, as is proper in a society which not only tolerates but actually cultivates freedom of thought and speech. But all the more, just because of this freedom, are we loyal to the nation which thus makes of us free men. Attorney General Biddle's action was a piece of highest statesmanship, for which all praise is due to him, and to the President who approved. It was as well a tribute to the people which will not be soon forgot.

V

It is good news from England that a Council of Christians and Jews has been organized in that country. This new Council is initiated under distinguished aus-

pices, including among its leaders the five top-ranking churchmen of Great Britain who will serve as joint presidents. Among these are William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, J. T. Whale, Moderator of the Free Church Council, and Joseph H. Hertz, Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire. The inaugural statement of the presidents of the Council reads as follows:

> In the forefront of their efforts to create division within every community, the Nazis have always placed anti-Semitism, which is repugnant to the moral principles common to Christianity and Judaism alike. "We cannot afford to ignore the effects of the steady propagation of this evil throughout the world. It is not only a menace to the unity of every community in which it takes root, but it is the very negation of those values on which alone we believe that a new and better world can be established.

What we have here, I assume, is a duplication of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, organized in this country some eight or ten years ago, and ably led through all this time by its founder, Dr. Everett R. Clinchy. Two attacks are in order against this monstrous evil of anti-Semitism. One, on the negative side, is a direct exposure and condemnation of the ignorance, superstition, and sheer bigotry which underlie all prejudice against the Jews. The other, on the positive side, is a demonstration of actual fellowship as between Christians and Jews—working and worshipping together as brethren in the spirit. It is this twofold activity which has so long and successfully been carried on by our American group. The same thing can and will now be done in England. And it is needed! It is appalling that, with the Jews of Europe in process of extermination at the hands of the Nazis, there should anywhere be any feeling against these unhappy people. One would think that, at such a time, there would arise one great wave of compassion to sweep the world of men. But it does not seem to work that way. The Nazi horror spreads like a contagion, and anti-Semitism becomes rife. Hence the wisdom and beneficence of this move to fight it as one would fight the plague! It is a tribute to the sanity and courage of our English brethren in the churches that they should be starting this movement at this time. Living within earshot of the battlefront, with bombers overhead and ruin underfoot, they set themselves serenely to this great task of justice and good will. Such people are indeed unconquerable.

VI

The *New Yorker* has discovered a new major industry here in America—the "military-expert industry." In its "profile" study of Major George Fielding Eliot, "the acknowledged grand old man" of this industry, it makes the business take on very much the aspect of a "racket." This becomes apparent in the expert business as run by the New York newspaper, *PM*, which has an anonymous expert called The General, who has been successively three perfectly ordinary journalists and reporters. At the other extreme stands Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York *Times*, who is a scholar and gentleman who may make some serious claims to knowledge in the military field. But one has only to read the *New Yorker's* exposé of Major Eliot to see what is meant by the "racket" idea. Another industry of this type is that presented these days by the radio commentators. Here is something approaching the proportions of a scandal—this offering of authoritative news analysis by anybody and everybody who can find a hair-tonic or tooth paste sponsor! Of course, there are commentators who adorn the air as a great scholar adorns a college faculty. Chief among these is Mr. Raymond Gram Swing, who has knowledge, experience, high intelligence, and a becoming sense of modesty. Another is Mr. Quincy Howe. But the group, as we know them today, is composed of men who know little more about the war than the ordinary newspaper reader, and who are thus frankly exploiting an anxious public for reasons best known to themselves. Still a third industry, or "racket," is that of the "foreign correspondent" of our newspapers and press associations. Some time ago one or two able and highly qualified men proved that there was money in writing books about Europe and Asia on the basis of newspaper observation and experience. All of a sudden there came a steady stream of books written by men who had been correspondents abroad of this newspaper or that syndicate. With the outbreak of the war, the stream became a torrent, and now threatens to turn into a devouring flood. All that is necessary apparently is for some youngster of twenty-four or twenty-five years of age to get abroad, spend a few weeks at some belligerent capitol or front-line observation post, and then come home and tell all about this war—what it means, and how it should be fought. There are of course men in this group who have a right to speak and to be heard. One of these is Mr. Louis Lochner, who is just now publishing his all important book on Germany. But most of them are adventurers who, for all their gallantry, have as little right to talk about this world crisis as any police reporter in New York. It is little to the credit of the public that books written by these men are being sold and read by the ton.

---

### The Rose of Sharon

The generations unto generations pass.
And yet I say, how long, how long the day!
Within this tipsy-topsy world, alas,
Is there no place where I can rest and pray!
But churches are at war; each has a way
Of death as well as life; "All flesh is grass,"
So saith the preacher; every man must pay
Through generations yet unborn for his trespass,
Then came a Word which of life was not death
And like the Rose of Sharon, crowned with light
Sent forth its perfume on the desert air
And blessed the weary world with healing breath;
Dawn sprang full-robed from out the bed of night
And offered up to heaven in peace her morning prayer.

WILLIAM W. LOCKE

# Jottings

It is one of the most beautiful and famous of the old Negro spirituals which has the refrain: "Not my brother, nor my sister, but it's *me,* O Lord, standin' in the need of prayer."

---

LOST: a Fascist dictator. Wears a black shirt and a monkey cap. Answers to the name of Benito. Last seen looking for a bone in North Africa. Finder please return to Adolph Hitler, Wilhelmstrasse, Berlin. No reward.

---

Making inquiry about fire-fighting equipment required by law in New York City for protection against bombing raids, I learned that the churches were classified by the fire department as "commercial buildings." H'm!

---

"The year 1942 was in my opinion the most fateful trial among the nations. I may say that the German people, and especially the Army, was safeguarded by Providence during the winter."—*Adolf Hitler, in his September 30th speech.*

This statement qualifies for first prize for blasphemy. Yet it reflects what everybody believes in wartime—that God is on our side. Why not follow Abraham Lincoln's advice and make sure that we are on God's side?

---

Listening to radio songs and reading newspaper poetry, I have again and again found myself wondering what would happen to our contemporary culture if "love" did not rhyme with "above," and "light" with "bright," and "skies" with "eyes," and "kiss" with "bliss." The inventors of the language evidently knew what they were doing!

---

The futility of retaliation was never more convincingly demonstrated than by the Dieppe episode. The Nazis threatened to shackle English prisoners in retaliation for the shackling of Germans captured at Dieppe, which London denied. The Canadians then threatened to load German prisoners with triple chains in retaliation for Germany's shackling English prisoners in retaliation for England's shackling German prisoners. Where is this sequence to end?

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

---

# Lincoln and the Gettysburg Address

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Three quarters of a century and more have passed since on a November day in 1863 Abraham Lincoln dedicated the cemetery at Gettysburg. When he closed with the words that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth, neither he nor the listening thousands realized that he had spoken words as immortal as those of the Hebrew prophets.

"The world will little note nor long remember what we say here." These words carry with them a touch of irony when we repeat them today for the Gettysburg Address has become one of the "pillars of fire" that light men struggling through darkness on the way to freedom. It is one of the three chapters in the testament of American democracy. It has stirred the inmost souls of men in all the lands washed by the waters of the seven seas. The Gettysburg Address, like the immortal hymn to Love attributed to St. Paul, belongs to all mankind.

A half century after it was spoken, Lord Curzon, Chancellor of the University of Oxford, gave an address before the University of Cambridge on "Modern Parliamentary Eloquence." In its closing paragraphs he referred to the three modern masterpieces of eloquence. "These three," he said, "are preëminent much as the Funeral Oration of Pericles was generally allowed to be the masterpiece of the ancient world."

The first he declared was the toast of William Pitt after the victory at Trafalgar. The other two? They were spoken by Lincoln: the Second Inaugural and the Gettysburg Address. "They were uttered," he said, "by a man who had been a country lawyer before he became a statesman. But they are among the glories and treasures of mankind. I escape the task of deciding which is the masterpiece of modern English eloquence by awarding the prize to an American."

Lord Curzon went on to say:

> The Gettysburg Address is far more than an occasional piece of oratory. . . . It is a pure well of English undefiled. It sets one to inquiring with nothing short of wonder, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" . . . It joined the local to the national, the occasional to the permanent. It went straight at the purpose which animated the soul of Abraham Lincoln. . . . Above all, it is a declaration of America's fundamental principle.

Perhaps we knew all this before Lord Curzon, Chancellor of the University of Oxford, told us so. Nevertheless, we all take vicarious satisfaction in the fact that this comes from an English aristocrat.

It was the evening of the Fourth of July, 1863. The clock in the office of the Secretary of War slowly, so slowly, ticked the hours away. Abraham Lincoln waited. With him were Stanton, Secretary of War; Seward, Secretary of State; and Wells, Secretary of the Navy. Abraham Lincoln in moody silence sat tipped back in his chair. He was not reminded of a story.

Eleven-thirty came. The Secretary of the Navy went home. The clock ticked on till it struck the hour of twelve. The telegraph clicked. The operator took the message. It was addressed to the Secretary of the Navy. Stanton seized it. It was signed, "Byington." It announced the victory at Gettysburg.

But who is Byington? Is the message true? These were the questions that were repeated again and again in the minds of these three men. No one of them knew Byington.

So Wells was routed out of bed and brought back to the War Office. When he got there, they thrust the message into his hand and demanded, "Who is Byington?"

Secretary Wells said, "He is the editor of a weekly paper in Norwalk, Connecticut. . . . He is reliable."

Between one and two o'clock that night the tall, gaunt form of Lincoln might have been seen walking through the darkness to the White House. The question, was Byington's message true, must have pressed in on his weary mind. Not till Tuesday did the President know of Grant's victory at Vicksburg, and not till Tuesday did complete confirmation of the Byington message come.

That night a procession was formed which, headed by a band, marched to the White House. Lincoln was called on for a speech. After an introductory sentence, Lincoln said, "Eighty odd years since, on the Fourth of July, for the first time in history a nation, by its representatives assembled, declared as a self-evident truth that all men are created equal."

We who read the Gettysburg Address now realize that it was conceived in that hour in Lincoln's inner habit of mind. Lincoln's first public expression on the subject of slavery was in a resolution signed by himself and Dan Stone, placed in the records of the Illinois legislature in 1837. In it are these words, "They [the signers] believe that the institution of slavery is founded on injustice and bad policy."

From this fundamental position Lincoln never deviated. Lincoln also believed that Congress had no right under the Constitution to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states.

The Emancipation Proclamation, issued January 1, 1863, was based entirely "upon military necessity"—an act which Lincoln held was warranted by the Constitution. The Emancipation Proclamation did not abolish slavery in the United States but only in certain portions of the nation and applied only to those persons then held as slaves in those parts. Slavery was not legally abolished until Congress on December 18, 1865, declared that 27 of the 39 states had ratified the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

Lincoln, in a letter written ten days before his death, affirmed the same sentiment he had expressed in his resolution presented twenty-seven years before to the Illinois legislature. He said, "I am naturally anti-slavery. If slavery is not wrong nothing is wrong."

It is true that Lincoln rested his case upon his duty to defend the Union. But no one can read his letters and speeches and not realize that deep down within him he thought of the Civil War in terms of democracy and freedom.

He said in an address to the 166th Ohio Regiment on August 22, 1864: "It is not merely for today, but for all time to come, that we should perpetuate for our children's children that great and free government which we have enjoyed all our lives."

I cannot escape the conviction that within Abraham Lincoln during the war years there was a terrific inner conflict. Whatever may have been his personal ambitions or his political stratagems, he knew and dreaded the inevitable conflict. Accepting his nomination to the United States Senate in 1858, he said in his speech, *A House Divided Against Itself,* "I believe a nation cannot endure permanently, half slave and half free."

With this firm conviction in his mind he became President, by a minority vote. As President it became his sworn duty to enforce the laws which sustained and perpetuated an institution which like some evil beast was eating the very heart of the nation he had sworn to protect.

He who knew that the Abolitionists were morally right was compelled to stop his ears to their pleadings and their bitter invectives. The conflict which he hoped might be avoided dragged on. The awful cost of human slavery was being paid for in human blood and human suffering.

As the years passed the conflict within the mind of Lincoln went on with increasing intensity. In letters and speeches we can read his, "I would but I cannot."

The Emancipation Proclamation relieved the tension necessarily. But the final word which would give spiritual meaning in the eyes of the world to the conflict awaited utterance. That word came at the cemetery at Gettysburg. It was a word deliberately spoken.

To understand this you must know how Lincoln happened to go to Gettysburg. Soon after the battle, the State of Pennsylvania created the National Soldiers Cemetery Corporation. The trustees were appointed by governors whose states lost men in the battle. Plans for the dedication were perfected in September. Edward Everett, the foremost orator in America, was invited to give the oration. Abraham Lincoln was not formally invited to attend. He did not have the individual invitation that was addressed to Everett and others. His was one of the printed circulars sent to many people. Barton says it was no different from the one sent to "a consul from Patagonia."

Lincoln accepted the invitation. The committee was embarrassed by his acceptance. But the member of the Board of Trustees from Illinois suggested that the President be invited to make a brief address. It was not till November 2nd that a formal invitation was sent—two weeks before the dedication. He agreed to make the "few appropriate remarks." They were to be the formal dedicatory words.

Why did he go? There are many explanations. He had been bitterly criticized after his visit to the battlefield of Antietam. There was a bitter factional political fight in Pennsylvania. He could give help by going to his ardent supporter, Governor Curtin, without offending the Cameron faction. William Barton, who has written a book on the Gettysburg Address enumerates a long list of reasons, from curiosity to see the battlefield to a desire to dedicate the whole nation to the unfinished task.

Sanborn says: "Various definite motives besides vague intuition may have guided Lincoln in his decision to attend and speak even though half his cabinet sent formal declinations."

But no words such as Lincoln spoke could possibly come out of an effort to allay political bickerings, or from his curosity to see the field of Gettysburg, or even to rebuke those who slandered him after his visit to Antietam. All these and many other superficial reasons cannot possibly account for the simple majesty, the deep reverence, the exalted passion of the immortal poem we call the Gettysburg Address.

To my mind the secret of the power and beauty of its words lies in the fact that they express Lincoln's first complete public admission that the war was for something more than the mere preservation of the Union. The terrible inner conflict was at an end. And out of that inner peace came those immortal words, words that have become a part of the foundation stones

of the structure we call democracy.

In these solemn cadences there is no vituperation, no hate, no petty parochial themes. There could not be; for in them Lincoln rises above the parochial, the national, to the field of humanity. In them he is a poet and prophet, chanting the great theme of democracy.

The summer of 1863 was perhaps in some ways the hardest for peace-loving Lincoln to endure. It is true, as he said after the capture of Vicksburg by Grant, "The Father of Waters flows unvexed to the sea."

It is true that Lee and his army had been driven south of the Potomac. But Lincoln knew that Mead had missed his great chance. The rains came. The Potomac was a swollen flood. Lincoln urged, pleaded, and all but commanded Mead to act. Mead did not. The waters of the river subsided. Lee and Lee's army passed in safety to the Southland. Lincoln then knew there would be no peace in 1863, for which he longed. The war must go on to its bitter end.

The Abolitionists, led by Wendell Phillips, (Garrison for once was sympathetic and understanding) were not satisfied with the Emancipation Proclamation. To them the war had no meaning except as it was a war for freedom. The criticism of Phillips especially was very bitter. The next presidential election was impending. The state elections of that year presented serious problems. Lincoln's supporters were urging that extreme measures be taken against the South. All this did not lighten Lincoln's burden. Harriet Beecher Stowe said in 1863 she felt about him "a dry and weary pain."

Lincoln said to her, "Whichever way it ends [the war] I have the impression that I shan't last long after it is over."

Lincoln was a soul-weary man in 1863. The mistakes and shortcomings of his generals, the bitter criticism heaped upon him, the failure of Mead which dashed all hope of an early termination of the war, bent but did not break him.

It was in the midst of all this that he was urged again and again that when the chance came he would speak what Whitman called the great word—Democracy. This was an appeal to cut through the legalistic barriers and go straight to the heart of the issue for which armies contended, whether they knew it or not. Anyone who knows Lincoln's reconstruction policy knows that he knew that the great issues must be decided finally in the hearts of men. Two men, John Murry Forbes and William Evans, an English liberal, did their best to impress on Lincoln the imperative need of his being a spokesman for world democracy. This they did in the weeks just before the Gettysburg Address.

Lincoln had the same fundamental conception of democracy as Walt Whitman. No matter what the incidental and superficial reasons were for his going to Gettysburg, the fact is that he went when it would have been easier to stay away. He went though it meant, as he well knew, a torrent of bitter abuse. He went though he knew his motive would be subject to the harshest criticism.

How did he prepare his speech? His whole life went into its preparation. It came out of the inner recesses of his being. It expressed his most holy convictions.

In Washington he wrote nineteen lines on a single sheet, ending with, "It is rather for us the living to stand here." The conclusion was written the night before he gave the Address, at the home of his host, Judge Wills.

On the day of the dedication Lincoln rode in the procession on a small horse. His feet almost touched the ground. He had a high hat on his head and white gauntlets on his hands. As he rode, his body was bent over.

Edward Everett gave his great oration. He spoke for one hour and fifty-seven minutes. A hymn was sung. The President was presented. He took from his pocket two sheets of paper, put on his spectacles, and then in his high, shrill voice spoke or read his address. When he finished, the people hardly realized that he had begun. The applause was perfunctory.

The question of the sources of the Gettysburg Address is after all a trivial one. Scholars have found similar phrases in many places. The concluding phrases are said to have been spoken by Cleon to the men of Athens in 520 B. C.

We know that Lincoln read and underlined these words, "A government of all the people, by all the people, for all the people" in two addresses by Theodore Parker. But as previously stated, the question of sources is as trivial as the question of the sources of the Declaration of Independence. What the world little heeded, the world has long remembered.

The Gettysburg Address is now in the treasure house of mankind. It, as Lincoln, belongs to the ages. It is a medium through which the spirit of Lincoln found free expression. Here are no legalistic phrases. The words were spoken to the hearts of men and women of all nations and of all time. Whenever and wherever it is read, it speaks to the deepest emotions of humankind. Today it calls on us to consecrate ourselves to the preserving and eulogizing of what the Fathers hath wrought.

The evening of November 19, 1863, the weary citizens of Gettysburg town rested in their homes. The dead lay silent in their graves; the flowers above dropped their heads. In the crowded train hurrying back to Washington tired men watched the passing of the miles. Lincoln lay on a side seat with a wet towel over his eyes.

The telegraphs clicked. Over the wires through the night on the wings of lightning went the story of the day to a thousand and more of sleeping cities. The hostile armies slept, awaiting another day. Presses in great cities rumbled as they printed their torrent of abuse and criticism. The Blue Ridge Mountains stood silent and immune. Fathers and mothers of sons dead slept fitfully; another morn would bring them memories burdened with sorrow.

At midnight the weary Lincoln got off the train at Washington. The questions, "Did I fail? Was it a mistake?" pressed in upon him.

And yet within there must have been a sense of peace. He had stood that day, as Carl Sandburg says, the world's foremost spokesman of popular government. For the first time since he became President, on a dramatic occasion he had declaimed, howsoever it might be read, Jefferson's proposition, "All men are created equal," leaving no other inference than that he regarded the Negro slave as a man.

No matter what the world might say, Lincoln had spoken Carlyle's "eternal nay" to age-old wrong.

The next day came those words of Everett, which gave courage to Lincoln's despondent soul: "I should be glad if I could flatter myself that I came as near to the central idea of the occasion in two hours as you did in two minutes." Lincoln then knew that some

at least understood.

The years have passed—and years will pass. The Blue Ridge Mountains will stand as sentinels over the valley below. The little mounds in the consecrated rows will sink into futile hollows. The garish monuments which fail to decorate the battlefield will crumble into dust. But the solemn cadences of the Gettysburg Address will ring in the ears of lovers of freedom during the ages to come. Their haunting beauty will lift men to high resolve and deeds of courage.

---

# Religion and the Future

F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT

The important change which has come over religion during the last fifty years is that of a movement from the supernatural to the natural. In many ways, it was a development both to be expected and welcomed. The rise to power of physical science has meant that large tracts of experience, formerly unexplained, are now graphed and charted. The controversy surrounding the claim of Darwin that the varied species were mutable shattered any idea of a static universe. Evolution was admitted as a principle applicable in its fullness to every branch of knowledge. The supernatural deductions extracted from religion on the strength of belief in a catastrophic creation melted away. Astronomy, biology, research into natural science, have laid the whole universe open to the observer. Nor has the matter ceased at this point. Psychology has carried on the same process within the realm of the mind. Instinct and motive can now be tracked out in a scientific manner. Conscience has been dethroned from its old sphere of preëminence. So too with sociology. Environment has been studied and labelled. It is possible to show how and why churches or sects arose without reference to supernatural inspiration. Indeed, there is no occurrence in the whole realm of history for which supernatural sanctions were formerly claimed, such as stories of the resurrection from the dead of Jesus or his power to work miracles, which could not be referred finally to natural occurrence or the growth of legend through application of methods of comparison and experiment to such evidence as may be available.

At first sight, this continued extension of the scientific attitude may seem to betoken the end of religion. It suggests a sanction for the cynicism of Sir Arthur Keith when he claimed that, after dissecting many hundreds of human bodies, he had never discovered a soul! Yet, this pessimistic surrender is one which lacks all final sanctions. It has, in fact, only been heard in two quarters. The orthodox religionist has used it for a root and branch attack upon science. He has insisted that morality is bound up with the conventional religious stereotype and that the collapse of one would lead inevitably to the collapse of the other. This must be recognized as a gratuitous assumption when it is recalled that the higher moral efforts of humanity have been hampered and derided, rather than assisted, by orthodox religious groups! At the other extreme, the typically Victorian materialist asserted that science has exploded religion, an assumption which it is not so easy to hold in the light of the treatment accorded to materialism by recent philosophers.

Religion depends, in the last resort, upon certain innate promptings in man to seek the highest and to strive for a better state than the contemporary situation in which he finds himself. It might be summarized as "Divine discontent." It presupposes a transcendent standard of values by which life may be judged and assessed. Prayer evolves into meditation and gradually sheds the method of mechanical petition. The man of religion possesses a mystical orientation of life which seeks the service of the criterion which he accepts as a qualitative measure. Historically, this sense has been dressed up in various supernatural beliefs. It has been claimed that religion, to be religion, must include certain far-reaching assertions about the nature of God, the form of an after-life, the revelation of God in man. The religious phenomena are, however, in steady process of evolving beyond this stage. The traditional guises of religion can be explained by the psychological theory of projection. The primitive savage naturally read the contents of his own belief into his religion. He made God not only in his own image but in that of the animals also. The same criticism could be passed upon the theology of any one period. The Yahweh of Hebraism was a reflection in essential characteristics of the social environment, so too was the Father of Jesus, and so too the triune Deity of the Catholic Church. The attributes claimed for each conception were drawn in large measure from the mental climate of the age and from the social environment of the period.

A cultural level has now been reached which calls for the evolution of a further stage in the history of religion. Over a course of many years, non-Catholic religion has been steadily losing its hold on the supernatural. There is the story of one retreat after another in its contests with scientific and literary research. The utter breakdown of traditional ideas of sin probably represents its last great defeat in this realm. Morality is conditioned by psychology; it is relative to given situations and environments. A meaning must be attributed to religion, if it is to survive in creative form, which associates its activities with the "here and now," making its sphere of relevance that of factual and empirical knowledge. The dogmas of traditional theology are associated of necessity with matters of speculation and of individual choice. If religion is to become relevant to the present stage in social and cultural evolution, it must find its sanctions in the scientific method and not in unprovable speculative opinion concerning supernatural realms. Its function lies in the poetry, the drama, the morality, of life. As was recognized by Professor Tyndall in his famous Belfast address of some sixty years ago, a religious attitude supplies through mysticism the balance to laboratory science. In this sense, the religion of the next stage in mental evolution will probably be Humanist in form. It is an acceptance of the claim that man both can and must save himself side by side with an equal acceptance that the foundations of religion must lie in scientific knowledge rather than in a theological approach rendered less and less probable as an accurate graph of the universe by the advance of research.

The question of religious experience arises at this point. There can be no religion without some experimental basis. A mystical sense defies rationalization

and implies a final unity which summarizes the values of living but whose infinite form cannot be comprehended in its fullness through a finite mind. In this sense, religious experience is open to man. The individual personality is capable of experiencing a communion with the infinite. Man therefore is in possession of a faculty of religious consciousness which takes him beyond the narrow secularity of a non-religious philosophy. But it defies sectarianism or dogmatic definition; the experience of a Hindu, a Calvinist, or an ethical mystic such as Dr. Stanton Coit, is probably of the same quality and context. The reality of the experience of the infinite is nevertheless one which no religion can neglect save at the cost of ceasing to be religion.

In some measure, an evolution of a mystical yet naturalistic type must be one which tends to pass out of the round of ideas associated with traditional Christianity. It is certainly non-Biblical in its general attitude. From this point of view, questions concerning the possibility of knowing the mind of Jesus are merely irrelevant. Even if the round of ideas proclaimed by Jesus could be recovered with accuracy, their relevance is to a previous stage in human evolution. The progress of investigation into the nature of the documentary sources has shaken the possibility of knowing anything very much about Jesus as he actually existed. His conventionalized figure cannot stand today for more than the place assigned to it by Lowes Dickinson or Laurence Housman. Jesus represents the symbol of certain mystical and moral ideals which have commended themselves to the more developed consciences of the human race. But he remains a symbol; there are wide tracts of legend in the available narrative and it is more than likely that the bulk of the story is unhistorical. The response to the symbol will be in other terms than those of Jesus himself. In this case, the roots of the symbol do not lie in factual history but in the emotional promptings to seek the highest which seem innate within the human race and which respond to the conventional portrait of the Christ.

There is one further issue which complicates the matter. Vast inroads have been made by secularity into the organized attitude of the churches. It is this antithesis to idealism, and not atheism or a dogmatic denial, which forms the exact opposite to religion. As a result, many conventional, organized religious groupings, though absolutely orthodox in belief, are irreligious in their outlook upon life. They possess no moral standard or criterion of judgment beyond a day-to-day opportunism. Much intense religious feeling, in a humanistic sense of the term, has been thrown up in a form detached from, and even antagonistic to, all ecclesiastical organization. It is a strange paradox that a stage has now been reached where many churches stand for "the world" whereas a great deal of contemporary religion is in opposition to the Church. The general collapse of idealism and loss of faith in the Christian stereotype has begotten another complication: men turn to lesser gods, Nazified philosophies take the place of the traditional Christian ethics.

The history of Unitarianism shows it to be peculiarly favored to assist in the religious difficulties of the time. It is unfettered by creeds; it is therefore free to develop in any manner conformable to its mind and conscience. It has always contained a streak of naturalism as opposed to supernaturalism; the Socinians were the rationalists of their day. Even though they were never English Unitarian ministers, both Dr. Moncure Conway and Dr. Stanton Coit have been able to work in close association with the movement. At least one wing of English Unitarianism could, without any sacrifice of principle, extend a right hand of fellowship to the Ethicists and the Rationalists. As he showed in his Conway Memorial Lecture and again in *Religion without Revelation,* there is a certain community of ground between the more advanced elements in Unitarianism and the views upon religion of Professor Julian Huxley. It may be suggested that, when old and new are considered within Unitarianism, the new points in this naturalistic direction. Unitarianism now has the choice of existing as a heterodox variant upon the general Christian tradition, or as standing for a positive religious contribution to the moral existence of man in terms of the naturalistic approach which science would seem to dictate. Its task would lie in assisting the general recovery of transcendent ethical values. The core of interest would then lie in the indwelling life revealed in nature and in humanity rather than in an assertion of the transcendence of Deity.

All religious creeds, like civilizations, seem to come to birth, to mature, to flower, to become overripe, to decay and die. There is no reason why orthodox formulations of Christianity should escape this process. The inroads of science, the general secularity of life, the rapid retreats made by religion in the face of advancing knowledge, suggest alike that the period of decay has been reached at last. If Unitarianism is content to find its outlet in seeking to liberalize this theological tradition, it must be involved inevitably in the decay. But there is a more suggestive approach to guide man from a definition of religion which insists upon the inclusion of reference to dogmatic speculation concerning the supernatural to one which is content to find its outlet in a way of life possessing a critical discrimination dependent upon a religious experience defined as the mystical orientation of the individual to an accepted standard of values transcending a mere secularity or opportunism.

---

### Nightmare

Out of the regions of night,
Out of the realms of gloom,
The spectres ride in their flight
Beneath the light of the moon.

The demons are wild with their mirth,
The devils shout in their glee,
For again the sons of earth
Are fighting most lustily.

O well may the fiends rejoice,
It is meet, their mirthful mood,
As they note man's angry voice,
His cry for his brother's blood.

On hundreds of battlefields
They behold the heaps of slain;
They list to the lip that yields
Its agonized moan of pain.

O demons, retrace your flight
To your cursed haunts of gloom,
Flee ye from the dawning light
Which heralds the war-fiend's doom.

For the day is almost here,
When the wars of earth are done.
O good men, keep cheer, keep cheer,
The Angel of Peace will come.

GEORGE L. THOMPSON.

# Reshaping the World

DAVID M. BLOCH

That we are witnessing today the gradual dissolution of our established order and are standing on the threshold of a new era is the confirmed belief of most of the influential writers who are interested in the social problem. Yet in spite of the flood of books dealing with this important topic, many of us have but a vague picture of what lies in store for us. There is great confusion among us as to the nature of the world order that is likely to emerge out of the present chaos or as to the part we are to take in speeding its coming. And no wonder! The great majority of the writers who are so much concerned about progress and who would lead us into the promised land are themselves, judging by their writing, confused and bewildered. In spite of their pretensions to modernity they seem to echo the ideas of a bygone age. With but few exceptions they are either hard-boiled, antiquated materialists, or maudlin Mid-Victorian idealists. Responsive neither to the realities of today nor to the aspirations of tomorrow, their point of view, as we shall see, is both obsolete and inimical to progress.

One thing is certain, if ever there was a time for clear thinking and resolute action, that time is now. We can no longer afford to remain quiescent in the face of the enormous task confronting us: to help create out of the ruins of the old world a better and more sane system. Unless this can be accomplished there will be no "peace on earth" or "good will to men" for generations to come.

But we will certainly get nowhere if we continue to pay heed to self-anointed prophets who for all their boasted knowledge have but little comprehension of the fundamental causes of the world crisis. Too many of them still harness their chariots to the outworn credo of "Historical Necessity," and thus grossly underrate the psychological and spiritual influences upon the social structure. All of our cultural aspirations and religious yearnings are turned to naught by these high priests of expediency. According to their way of thinking it is primarily the economic, material forces that shape events and determine our destiny. Neither in this nor in the future society that they visualize are free, spontaneous activity or higher values taken into consideration.

Yet in the long run it is free men—men who under no consideration will submit to tyranny—who are the true guardians of civilization. It is men of that calibre who throughout the ages have kept the torch of liberty burning. Their great influence in shaping the course of history proves that we are not, as the materialists would have us believe, mere helpless pawns in the grip of material energies. We can, if we have the moral courage to exercise our will, form the world to a considerable degree according to our plans.

The sentimental idealists or liberals, on the other hand, fall into the opposite error of exaggerating the relative value of idealism and of minimizing the importance of the material necessities. They naively believe that if we will but return to the faith of our fathers and proclaim anew the democratic gospel, all of our present-day ills will vanish into thin air. The gross inequalities and injustices of our competitive system, for example, can speedily be adjusted, they tell us, if both capital and labor consent to follow the golden rule. As for the terrible war now raging throughout the world, that too, according to these modern Don Quixotes, could easily have been avoided. After the Nazis have been defeated, some court of arbitration set up by the victorious Allies will make all future conflicts impossible, we are assured.

This kind of muddled thinking only adds to the general confusion already prevalent. It leads to defeatism and strengthens the hands of the enemies of freedom.

We cannot afford to be too optimistic. The fact remains that nature is to a great extent sinister and destructive. She seldom favors us, and frequently thwarts our highest aspirations. It is because liberalism refuses to recognize this truism that it is unable to make any headway in solving the social problem. The great majority of liberals intoxicated with the optimistic gospel of Rousseau—a gospel which glorifies nature and the natural man—are altogether too confident in the triumph of their ideal. They fail therefore to take the proper precautions against the forces of evil, and when a crisis occurs they are caught unaware. Nor is liberalism capable purely on the basis of natural sanctions to formulate a right code of ethics for the regeneration of society.

Only a realistic idealism—an idealism rooted in mysticism and yet not divorced from the harsh realities of life—can shake us out of our complacency and make us conscious of the destined role we are to play in these critical times. It is toward leaders, therefore, who possess this complex vision that we must turn for guidance if we are not to give way to despair.

While such men are rare in this materialistic, jazz age, we nevertheless possess a few of whom we can well be proud: Reinhold Niebuhr, Berdayev, Gerald Heard, Von Passen, Stuart Cloete, Frederick Schuman, Waldo Frank. It is only regrettable that they do not have the following they merit. Liberals and radicals who clamor for a change and should be the first to recognize such genuine, creative thinkers refuse to take them seriously. Most liberals and radicals somehow naturally distrust anyone who inclines toward mysticism and religion. It it nearly always associated in their minds with obscurantism and reaction. Has not the Church, they argue, throughout its long history been opposed to progress? And have not the mystics and religionists often stood on the side of reaction? Besides, they protest, how can anyone in this enlightened age still cling to a spiritual view of the universe? Has not science long ago destroyed the very foundation on which such belief can be grounded?

That there is some justification in considering religion in such an unfavorable light, the modern mystics —particularly those to whom I have referred—would be the last to deny. They are only too well aware of the shortcomings of the Church. Nor are they blind to the fact that mystics or religionists have often served the forces of reaction. But they do not believe that the genuine religionist or mystic should be held responsible for the vagaries of pseudo-mysticism or the abuses of religion. The function of true religion, they claim—and rightly so—is to promote brotherhood, establish justice, and inculcate in man a reverence for the great mystery of life, neither of which can be accomplished solely through secular institutions.

Nor is the assertion true that science has forever dis-

credited any ideology which aims to interpret the world in spiritual terms. Nature to a great extent still remains a closed book. Science, in spite of its many remarkable discoveries, is unable to explain even the origin of matter, let alone mind. Then, there is that limitless, unexplored field of telepathy and kindred psychic phenomena which seems to be altogether beyond the reach of science.

Moreover, it should be obvious by now that notwithstanding the good intentions and noble inspirations of science, it cannot single-handed cope with the social problem. Science needs the inspiration of religion if real progress is ever to be achieved.

Before religion, however, can become an effective instrument in reshaping the world, it will have to free itself from the shackles of "special privilege" and obscurantism. Its protagonists must be able to recapture somewhat of the indomitable passion for justice and righteousness which possessed the ancient Hebrew prophets, and in no mistaken terms denounce the powerful and rich for their iniquities. They must cease paying homage to Caesar and align themselves on the side of the progressive elements who would liberate mankind from the thralldom of capitalism.

It is also imperative that worship should become free of rigid dogma and superstition. The rites of the church and synagogue are to a large degree still medieval. If religion is to become once more truly creative, its institutions must change their credo to conform to the material and spiritual needs of today.

These human needs must be satisfied if there is to be peace. It was the failure of Western democracy to satisfy man's economic and spiritual wants that helped to bring about the first, and now the second, World War. The victory over the Nazis, therefore, important as it is, will not be complete unless we are ready at the same time to make the necessary, drastic changes in our political, economic, and social structure.

We in the democratic lands can no longer afford to evade the issue or shirk our responsibility. The old order based on greed and exploitation is dying and no power on earth can save it. Shall a better order rise in its place or will another dark age descend upon us? That depends altogether upon our decision. If we act wisely and in time we need not fear as to what the answer shall be.

---

# Trumpets on New Horizons

EDITED BY LUCIA TRENT

### Maccabee and Nazarene

Tyrants are held
by an iron tether
where greed and hate
are twined together.
But love still flames
this wintry weather,
Menorah light
and Christmas tree,
Nazarene
and Maccabee
Step hand in hand
to victory.
Climb hand in hand
with valor cloaked
and courage shod,
upward to the hills
of God.

FANIA KRUGER.

### We Give You the World of Tomorrow

In this day of the splitting of nations,
In this hour of the crashing of creeds,
The bringer of new revelations,
The seer that humanity needs—

The singer with beauty redeeming,
And with prophecy armoured and shod,
Now weaves from the fabric of dreaming
The mystical city of God.

The world of your proud men and cold men,
The world of your facts and your rules,
Now falls to the glad men and bold men,
For facts are the playthings of fools.

But songs are the slayers of sorrow,
The freight of the Ultimate Ark,
We give you the world of Tomorrow,
The world that we dreamed in the dark.

LILITH LORRAINE.

### Life Is Good

What shall I say of life? My own scant part
From all the universe freely to spend
To gain or lose the goal? My mind and heart?
The strong and true of all the ages blend
Their lives with evil men and witless ones,
Leaving some mark to heal or scar the whole.
But sinner, or saint, to each of all the sons
Of men is given, by God, a deathless soul.

From each, life calls for gallant search for right.
What though the world be wracked by greed of men,
There's beauty still of earth and starry night;
And peace and trust from wars shall rise again;
There still is faith in human brotherhood;
Still, immortality. Yes, life is good.

AMY BRUNER ALMY.

### Above the Ruin of War

The ruins lie with smouldering cloud of hate
Still feebly rolling up in livid glare,
And all the pride of man in his estate
Has fallen like the heart in its despair.

A withered earth! But still a yearning soul!
Imperishable music interblends.
The gales are blowing on the shattered whole
But spirit, feeling winds of Heaven, ascends.

ALINE B. CARTER.

# The Procedure of Persuasion

DONALD HARRINGTON

Democracy, as I understand it, means freedom, freedom within and throughout society. It means freedom of speech, press, religion, assembly, and freedom from want, unemployment, and starvation. It means as much freedom of individual action as is consonant with the good of the whole of society. A growing democracy means more freedom in more realms of life for more people. It must be dynamic, for it either extends itself or perishes; it must grow to live. For instance, in the United States we have had a large degree of political freedom without freedom from want, with the result that our political freedom has slowly been stifled. Democracy recognizes that true freedom must be a social thing, embracing all of the human beings who make up the society. It must not be the freedom of one individual at the expense of the other. Rather it seeks for a kind of equilibrium among men which we call justice. Its aim is the achievement of justice and equality. It seeks a sharing of freedom throughout the community in such a way that all may enjoy to the fullest extent possible the blessings of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Further, democracy seeks to bring the equalitarian society into being by means of persuasion, discussion, and negotiation. It seeks to solve conflicts by means of reason and dynamic good will. It encourages discussion in the belief that from opposing or conflicting theses a higher synthesis will be achieved if sought with sincere good will. It places its faith in the techniques of education for helping individuals to find their highest good and best interest in that which is best for the whole of society. The Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States expresses the faith that the exercise of freedom of expression and discussion is the most effective way of bringing about a democratic society; the belief that terror and violence do not alter opinions, but rather serve to send them underground and to accentuate them, and that the way to solve conflicts within society is by use of reason.

But occasionally democracy drops its method of free persuasion and takes up the methods of war for solving its conflicts. It does so reluctantly. But when it does so it is using an instrument so contradictory to its own essence that it frequently destroys itself in the process. In wartime, the methods of persuasion are abandoned in favor of the method of violence. Freedom of speech is denied, not so much by legislation as by public opinion. The rabid intolerance of some self-appointed censors stifles freedom "for the duration." Our civil liberties, then, tend to be a fact only in times of peace, in times of fundamental agreement. In times of crisis, that is, whenever the content ceases to be a mere heated quibbling over details, then toleration becomes too expensive. But may it not be legitimately asked if our civil liberties are no protection in a crisis, when they are needed, what good are they?

Wars have always destroyed, temporarily at least, civil liberties. For war is a setting aside of the habits of democracy in favor of dictatorship. It is a setting aside of the habits of reason and persuasion for the habits of arbitrary authority and violence. And so every war hurts democracy, for it helps destroy the processes upon which democracy depends for life. Democracy in past history has made progress in spite of its wars, and not because of them. Every war witnesses a retardation of democracy.

The pacifist believes that democracy, that is, the equalitarian society, has been advanced through the years by means of the methods of persuasion, and that future advance will be made in the same way. Wars retard that advance. The conflict which issued in the American Revolutionary War could probably have been solved with a little patience on both sides. Many public spirited men in both England and America were working for a reasonable and peaceful solution. Who can say that America's contribution to the world development and to world peace would not have been greater if the separation had never taken place. And how sad it is that we had to fight two wars with Britain before seeking union with her again. The conflict which issued in the Civil War has not yet been solved, eighty years after that war is over. Who can say that it would not have been solved better if we had followed, with a little patience on the part of all, the lead of Britain and many of our own leaders in a movement to free the slaves by purchase from their owners. While it is possible to persuade a man by holding a gun to his head, he is apt to forget when the gun is taken away.

The pacifist believes that men have resorted to war when persuasion was still possible. For they have not yet been convinced of the sterility of war. They think that gains can be made from war, that democracy can be advanced, when as a matter of fact it may be retarded or destroyed. The pacifist is trying to bring the era of peaceful negotiation of conflicts nearer by refusing to participate in any war and urging others to do likewise; by developing techniques of persuasion —through reasonableness combined with non-violent resistance to evil—directed at overcoming the will of the evil-doer; and by supporting proposals for an equalitarian solution to the world's international and economic problems, which would remove the inclination and necessity for resort to armed force.

Pacifists are convinced that so far in this war the democracies of the world have scarcely tried, let alone exhausted, the possibilities of solving the present conflict by means of persuasion. Because they do not seem truly to seek an equalitarian world order, they dare not use the methods of reason, especially if their own ends are not reasonable or equalitarian. Pacifists are further convinced that if the methods of persuasion were conscientiously tried, the war could be ended in victory for democracy everywhere, that the Germans themselves would take care of Hitler, and the Japanese of Hirohito. Specifically they would suggest:

1. That the democracies assure all nations of the world now that they will not be punished, starved, persecuted, and robbed, but that all will take their places at the peace table on terms of equality with all others.
2. That the democracies call a Constitutional Convention as soon as war ceases, to set up a world constitution patterned after the Constitution of the United States, covering all international affairs such as international commerce, shipping, money, raw materials, markets, and so forth, and guaranteeing equality of opportunity for all.
3. That the democracies organize a World Conference in the United States now, under Congressional leadership, made up of representatives from every nation in the world, with the Axis and Axis-invaded countries represented by their democratic leaders in exile, to do the preliminary work of

drawing up the World Constitution, and that the work be accepted by Congress as it proceeds.

4. That the democracies broadcast the news of the progress of world democracy unceasingly by short-wave radio to the oppressed peoples of the earth urging them to rid themselves of their tyrants or to force them to make peace so that they would be able to take their equal place in a Democratic World Federation.

Pacifists, while doing nothing to obstruct the war effort of the United States, are standing firm in their position. For just as civil liberty, which is only permitted when there is no great and fundamental issue at stake, is of little use, so also a pacifism that is only valid in times of peace is of little influence. The pacifists are refusing to participate in war so that they may continue to bear their witness to the methods of peaceful persuasion, and so that they may be ready to welcome peace back when it comes. Ling Tan, the old Chinese farmer in Pearl Buck's *Dragon Seed,* steeped in the pacifism of Chinese philosophy, forgets the pacifism and fights against the Japanese and kills men ruthlessly for a while. But finally as he watches his fellows killing and hating, he determines that he himself must kill no more, "lest there be no one prepared to welcome peace when it comes again." Perhaps that will be the function of the modern pacifist as well.

# The Study Table

### The Way Out

OUT OF DARKNESS. *By John Haynes Holmes. New York: Harper & Bros. 151 pp. $1.50.*

The prophetic voice of John Haynes Holmes speaks again amid the rapidly changing scene. The author's sincerity and courage equal that of the Old Testament prophets. Some readers may think he is over-pessimistic, but Jeremiah was so judged. And Jeremiah was right, otherwise his book would not have survived. Some may think the author dwells too much on the side of doom, but so did all the prophets, while at the same time teaching the doctrine of the "remnant." Nobody could have written this book unless he were thoroughly steeped in Old Testament prophecy. This is one reason why *Out of Darkness* will survive the vast number of books now issuing from the press and dealing with the war. Almost all these books are ephemeral, and some are scarcely worth the paper on which they are printed, but this book is different.

Doctor Holmes sees civilization in grave peril; it is like those before it which have died in turmoil. The new Dark Ages are almost upon us. Already Churchill and Roosevelt have warned the United Nations that this present war is to be a long one. Since this is so, its meaning and consequences ought to be clearly understood. The majority of people have not realized this. Many have used the war as a way of advertising cigarettes, beer, and other things. To say the least, this seems lacking in patriotism. This book faces the consequences of all insincere and stupid behavior as it analyzes the probable results of what we have called Western civilization.

The author draws parallels between the World War (the Second is but a continuation of the First) and those we read about in our school books and thought belonged to a distant past. "What lies before us in this war, in all probability, is a long-drawn-out struggle, tending steadily to a kind of stalemate of mutual exhaustion, not unlike the Peloponnesian War (431-404 B. C.), the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), the Hundred Years' War (A. D. 1337-1453), or even the barbarian wars which accompanied, accelerated, and at last completed the decline and fall of the Roman Empire." Now it is wise to remind us that a war has lasted a hundred years, but wars then were mild forays compared with destruction as it is mobilized today. H. G. Wells, as the author points out, reminded us a generation ago that "never again in our time shall we know peace." The fighting is not the worst; it is merely the forerunner of more deadly ills: exhaustion of all resources, plagues and epidemics, perhaps even bandits with private armies, famine, and destitution. Then will come the talk of peace.

The author again is pessimistic, holding that there is little likelihood that humanitarians will write the peace or truce. He believes it likely that false leaders will again perpetuate the war system. But the end is not yet—at long last the author believes that common sense, decency, and truth will prevail. The present generation must suffer the sins of the fathers. Doctor Holmes has a genuinely religious philosophy of history as did Isaiah before him. In spite of all the darkness of the present hour, it has never been so easy to behold the arm of God in history. Here he comes to the Kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus long ago. The nations have gone their own ways, but a few thousand years with man are as naught to God. The Kingdom of God is yet to come, and it will come "out of the darkness." This book ought to be compulsory reading for all who are depressed or discouraged, and especially for all who seek a Christian philosophy for times like these.

C. A. HAWLEY.

### Too Hopeful

UNTIL THAT DAY. *By Kressmann Taylor. New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce. 314 pp. $2.75.*

It must have come as a rude shock to the pilot of the Nazi steam-roller which for years had rolled along to power so smoothly on its wheels of propaganda, terror, bluff, and chicanery to discover that its progress could actually be interfered with, even though not stopped. In this novel by Kressmann Taylor we have the story of this first attempt at organized resistance to Hitlerism after 1933, and surprisingly it came from a rather unexpected source, namely the Lutheran state church. Those of us who have followed the heroic career of Martin Niemoeller as champion of the faith and plain-spoken critic of Hitler's attack on Christianity in Germany, will enjoy this story as told in the first person by one who experienced those stirring days when Hitler tried to bend the will of Christian Germany to his dictum in the matter of religion and morals, and found at first silent and passive, but soon thereafter open and organized resistance.

Kressmann Taylor has Karl Hoffmann tell his story with all the freshness and spirit that derive from personal experience and first-hand observation. The narrator and hero of this story is now the minister of a little back-country church in America; whoever he is

and wherever he lives, he has rendered a service to American readers and incidentally has provided the author of *Until That Day* with material for plot and characterization of which she does not always make the fullest and best literary use.

Until the day when a new spirit of humanitarianism and brotherhood captures the German mind and compels pastors and laity to stand up and speak out for common decency, against anti-Semitism, against terror, against the "Deutschland uber alles" chauvinism, and against the whole sorry mess of racial superiority and power-mania; until that day appears in more convincing evidence in Confessional Church ranks and elsewhere, we shall have to conclude that *Until That Day* paints an entirely too hopeful picture of a revitalized religious faith in Germany, and that not only hopes and prayers but probably much more "blood and sweat and tears" will have to be spent by German church people before the spiritual rebirth of Germany can be assured.

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

---

### Idealistic Liberalism

WHAT MAN CAN MAKE OF MAN. *By William Ernest Hocking. New York: Harper & Brothers. 62 pp. $1.00.*

This book is likely to be ignored. First, because it is so brief! Yet why a man must extend his thought into enormous tomes in order to state the truth may well be questioned. Plato knew how to say a good deal in a short dialogue, as Emerson in a short essay.

Then this book is charmingly written. It has wit, urbanity, simplicity, exquisite beauty, and utter clarity. But the tradition still persists, and is still practised, that a philosopher or theologian cannot be profound unless he is tortuous in his style and obscure in his thought. Hocking, like Plato before him, proves the contrary, for this book probes deep.

Lastly, there is the fact that Hocking still believes in man, and this today is heresy. Calvinism is now to the fore again. Man is hopeless—he can do nothing but sin—God's grace can alone save him from the utter degradation of an inherent nature which is alien to virtue! But in this book we get a restatement of the despised idealistic liberalism which sees essential divinity in man. Professor Hocking actually starts out with the declaration that man is his own maker and therefore the master of his own destiny. If he makes a bad job of it, he may try again, and may succeed, for the eternities are within him. "In time he finds out his mistake, rejects his adopted ideal of himself, and makes a new one. . . . [This] is the deep-running 'dialectical' process of history."

What Professor Hocking has done in this remarkable treatise is to preach again the gospel of man. Not that he is satisfied with man! He sees the catastrophe of this age which is none other than the sign and symbol of man's failure, and worse than failure. He asks, "What is Western civilization and how did it happen?" And he has his answer. He sees, for example, the role of science in preparing universal disaster for our world—its elimination of mind from the facts of experience, and of purpose from the process of history. Science intended no wrong — it sought only to base a true method of inquiry upon the firm foundation of observed phenomena. But the net result of scientific research in our time is "the dismissal of value," and therewith the declaration of the meaninglessness of man and all his works.

Second only to this tragedy of science is that of the concept of human rights. Along with science and its technological applications as a distinctive feature of our western life, has gone our resolve "to give rights to individuals which the state itself is bound to respect." This is perhaps our greatest contribution to human civilization. But in the beginning, as still in the best liberal thought, this idea of rights had "a theological parentage." Man as an individual had rights because he was in himself a sacred creature, a child of God. Man was "endowed by his Creator" with these rights which were thus "unalienable." As John Locke, the philosophical father of Thomas Jefferson put it, "The Lord and Master of us all" has not "by any manifest declaration of his will set one [man] above another." So we are equal—and free! But in course of time this spiritual concept of human rights began to disappear. Freedom came to be interpreted in terms of expediency. It was in the interest of the social welfare that men should exercise unfettered liberty. But what is the social welfare? Who shall decide what it is? In whose interest shall it be judged? These are dangerous questions. "Shifting the basis of rights from theology to reason," as Professor Hocking puts it, "brings not clarity but perplexity," and "the way lies open for Leaders," i.e., Fuehrers!

"The modern era, with its fruit in Liberalism," continues Professor Hocking, "was begotten of Principle." And to Principle it must now return! What this means, in essence, is a rediscovery of the Soul, which the author defines as "simply the human self in its dealings with its total horizon, trying to hold its bearings in the infinite universe of fact and meaning." But we cannot stop with the Soul, which takes us straight back to God. There is but one "healing fact" which can save us in this hour. It is "the truth that the world, like the human self, has its unity in a living purpose. It is the truth of the existence of God."

Professor Hocking's book is as significant as it is able. For a long time now civilization has been trying to solve its problems without religion. It has tried politics, economics, sociology, psychology, science, and all have failed. And failed because the one essential element has been missing! It is as old as history, and as new as the experience of this dire age, that in God alone can we find salvation. Man, like the Prodigal Son, must "come to himself," and in that true self, or soul, find the secret of his divine being, and therewith the solution of life's riddles.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

---

### Memorable Poetry

MUSIC IN MINIATURE: *An Anthology of Short Forms. Edited by Lucia Trent and Ralph Cheyney. San Antonio, Texas: Carleton Printing Co.*

"Concentrated utterance is the very quintessence of memorable poetry," says Gordon LeClaire in his dynamic Foreword to this anthology of poems in brief poetic forms. Such utterance is especially suited to the swiftly moving tempo of this age, as poems from two to ten lines can be nuggets of forceful lyric expression.

The ninety pages of poems in these forms represent a pleasing variety of structure and content, ranging from some of the Old French Forms to newly invented ones. Preceding the poems are several pages of de-

scriptive studies of the forms, prepared with meticulous care by the assistant editor, Gordon LeClaire, eminent poet of Canada. These studies make this book invaluable for use in educational institutions.

Edited by the late Ralph Cheyney, whose own gift for concentrated utterance was matchless, and by his brilliant widow, Lucia Trent, this volume represents years of painstaking culling from the best in contemporary art. It is dedicated "with profound love to the memory of Ralph Cheyney, Litt. D., the glow of whose life remains.

"an arc of light flung forward
Into our triumphant tomorrow!"

ETTA JOSEPHEAN MURFEY.

# Correspondence

### India and Gandhi

TO UNITY:

As a reader of UNITY for fully two decades I have agreed with its general tenor, especially the editorial disquisitions.

However, more recently I have occasion to disagree with your commendation of Gandhi's extreme isolationism as it might be termed. In a peaceful world such as heretofore existed, his non-violence principle held good, and it reacted strongly against British dominance.

But since the war has started and the Japs look toward an invasion of India in the near future, India can no longer be a passive and peaceful nation and allow themselves to be overridden by the treacherous Japs.

We were supposedly at peace and took no heed to their war preparation, when they unexpectedly and perfidiously attacked us at Pearl Harbor. Then a few days later, observing our non-warlike attitude, the Nazis declared war on us—a war we did not expect, nor were we prepared for it at the time.

Gandhi, with his influence of an arrant non-violence principle, is placing his nation in the same situation as we were at Pearl Harbor. Once he contemplated negotiating with the Japanese to spite the British, as it was reported, but Nehru and the India Congress quashed that absurd proposition at once.

It is a pity that Gandhi is undoing all his previous assistance to his country by his present unreasonable attitude. In fact he is responsible for the revolution now going on in India. Good will is not effective against unreason. Demanding immediate spot action for independence without negotiating through a representative commission or a delegation of all the different elements of the country is impractical. But the hotheads of the people thus refused brought on the revolt against the government, which naturally had to be suppressed.

L. E. BLOCHMAN

*Berkeley, California*

### Reply to Mrs. Eastman

TO UNITY:

I was interested in reading Elaine Goodale Eastman's article on "Our Forward-Looking Indians" in the September issue of UNITY. While there is undoubtedly some truth in what she has to say regarding certain public attitudes, the condemnation of our governmental program on behalf of Indians cannot be accepted. Until 1933 the Indian Service of the United States worked on the basis that she suggests—rapid assimilation—and the program was catastrophic for our Indian groups. This does not mean that assimilation may not in the long run be a proper goal, but certainly method in this regard is all important. Indian cultural elements have proved to be more tenacious than Mrs. Eastman gives them credit.

The present Indian policy is not to force a "primitive" life on the Indians which they wish to reject, but to encourage worth-while cultural expressions which have deep significance to many of the United States Indians. Many Indian arts and crafts have intrinsic value, and are no more deserving of the label "primitive" than our own crafts—they have as long a history behind them and a comparable evolution. If through the discovery of new markets, these crafts are encouraged and the craftsmen enabled to obtain a higher income, the effort should not be disparaged. Certainly Indians with nurses' training or with qualifications for professional or industrial work are not forced to tan skins or sew beads on them.

Regarding Mrs. Eastman's statement, "As normal human beings, with proper pride, we may be certain that they do not want to be subsidized, protected, and governed as a permanent minority group," if Mrs. Eastman means by "normal human beings" persons brought up in our occidental culture and to our occidental point of view, Indians are not "normal." With the same biological capabilities as ours, nevertheless their culture has not prepared them to be held to "the same standards as others." The Zuni, for instance, grow up in an environment where the individualist is a misfit, and the man who serves wholly his community without thought of self, helping his people without rising above them, is the ideal. How could such a person, suddenly thrown among ourselves, be expected to have the same standards as we? In the second place, the "subsidy" and "protection" given the United States Indians today is a historical result of past treaties with Indian tribes, from a commendable attitude on the part of our government that past maladministration of Indian affairs must be remedied by present measures, and, most important, from the absolute necessity of doing something for a sector of the population which, from the purely public administrative point of view, needs it. The social services received by Indians are no greater nor more costly than those provided by various government levels to small cities having as many inhabitants as do the reservations.

All the above does not refer to those who just happen to be of Indian blood. Indians are not forced to live on reservations and accept unwelcome governmental services—many have left and become assimilated. The Indian Service attempts to serve *cultural* Indians, which refers to social organization, religion, economy, values, points of views—or any one of these things—about which there is nothing of a "primitive and rudimentary" nature. Indeed, rather than forcing persons of Indian blood to remain of Indian culture, the Indian Service has found itself forced to attend to persons of predominantly white blood who because of some distant Indian ancestor cling to their aboriginal status to get the legal protection afforded Indians.

As for Mrs. Eastman's remark that Indians should be left to determine for themselves what elements of their old life should be carried over into modern society, she apparently is unaware that planning in the Indian Education Division is toward training young Indians to a consciousness of their particular social position in the world today, and the problems it entails, so that they may work out their own salvation.

"Look forward" is a commendable injunction but in doing so it is usually best to give an occasional glance backward so that one will know where he is coming from, and why, and how.

RACHEL REESE SADY

*Mexico, D. F.*

### Prayer—Talk to One's Self

TO UNITY:

In reading "A Humanistic Concept of Prayer" by Randall S. Hilton in the August, 1942, issue of UNITY I was reminded of what a dear friend once said to me when this subject was discussed: "The most effective prayer is intelligent action."

I see prayer as a sort of talk to one's self. A retiring to an inner sanctum—sometimes even in the midst of the hubbub of a crowd—because we have need of consulting the "I"—the law of our being; the confusion of the ponderables having brought us to an impasse. As Mr. Hilton says, the purpose of prayer is to "create a frame of mind, to bring about that discipline of thought and feeling which will enable us to understand, to adapt, to utilize all the factors involved in the problem with which we are concerned."

Henry George, a great American—to me even greater than our "Honest Abe" Lincoln—has said, regarding our country:

> . . . . it has come to pass that the great republic of the modern world has adopted at the beginning of its career an institution that ruined the republics of antiquity; that a people who proclaim the inalienable rights of all men to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness have accepted without question a principle which in denying the inalienable right to the soil, finally denies the equal right to life and liberty; that a people who at the cost of a bloody war have abolished chattel slavery, yet permit slavery in a more widespread and dangerous form to take root.

Here is indicated the "intelligent action" required to make prayers for peace effective. Unless this evil *root* is destroyed, war is inevitable.

LYDIA NILSSON STJERNBERG.

*New York, N. Y.*